No. 282

The Christian News-Letter

Edited by KATHLEEN BLISS

2nd April, 1947

NEWS-LETTER

ANGLO-AMERICAN POLICY IN GERMANY

POLITICS AND EDUCATION IN GERMANY

SUPPLEMENT

EASTER: SOLOVIEV'S "THREE DISCUSSIONS" BY J. H. OLDHAM

THE DAILY REPORTS of the proceedings of the conference of foreign ministers at Moscow unfold the vast complexity of the problem with which the conference is dealing. They also give the persevering reader a great deal of information about all four zones of Germany. Each of the major subjects on which information has been exchanged, prisoners of war, reparations, denazification, industrial rehabilitation, would provide ample material for a long discussion. We propose in this News-Letter to give attention to one important fact about the conference, the emergence of at least the beginnings of an Anglo-American policy for Germany. This will remain important even if the conference fails to reach final agreement.

ANGLO-AMERICAN POLICY FOR GERMANY

Mr. Bevin remarked at Moscow that "we have learned much about the German problem since last March", and this might equally have been said on behalf of the United States. The policy upon which, with some points of difference, they now agree has been thrust upon them by close contact with the realities of the situation in Germany. The plain fact is that unless a viable economy can be built up in Germany, the British and American taxpayer will have to pay the cost of all imports into Germany. In their view,

also, in spite of their clear recognition that nearly all peaceful industry can be turned to war production at short notice, a Germany which has a low but tolerable standard of economic life is less likely to cause a breach of the peace than one which has disintegrated into chaos and misery, giving full opportunity to desperate and violent men.

The chance that the Russians and the French will agree to work for the same end seems slender. The first concern of the Russians is reparations. The demand for industrial equipment and industrial exports to the value of $10,000,000,000, a sum equal to the value of Germany's gross exports for ten average pre-war years, is of itself enough to make a workable economy in Germany impossible. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that, to the Russian Government, the survival of the German people, which appeared as the last of Mr. Molotov's ten points of policy in his speech at Moscow, is an accident to which it would not raise objection rather than an end which it would try to further. (Incidentally the pursuit of a policy of depredation is the surest way for Russians to forfeit the chance of a communist Germany. It was something of a surprise to them that the communists failed to achieve a majority in the elections in Berlin last year. It is said with much bitterness by Germans in Berlin that raw materials are brought from Russia into the Russian zone of Germany, and that the finished products are returned to Russia.) The French believe that the Germans are incorrigible and ineducable and that the only safety lies in keeping them down. A News-Letter correspondent who has had a close association with post-war France writes: "the hatred and bitterness felt by the French, understandable as they are, lead to totally unconstructive, and in the end to unrealistic, thinking, of which some of the best men in France are at heart ashamed."

There is plenty of cause for gloom in the possibility of serious disagreement between the powers. While the representatives argue at the conference table, the sands are running out in Europe. Two factors, however, give us some ground for hope. The first is the close approximation of the British and American view, which could not have been

foreseen two years ago when indeed fears were expressed in this country and in some circles in the United States, that the Americans might pull out of Europe at an early date. The second hopeful factor lies in the moral sphere and is not less important for that. It is that in democracies those policies generally have the greatest chance of success which appeal to what is best in a nation. There are plenty of people in Great Britain and the United States who are prepared to support and work hard to implement a policy in Germany which holds the possibility (not, admittedly, a very rosy one) of doing something constructive. The lack of such a policy so far in British dealings with Germany has, in fact, taken the spirit out of some of the best of the younger men working for the Control Commission. A friend of the News-Letter who was in Germany recently reports the following remarks from one such young man : " I am on my way to schedule for demolition a factory making household utensils, and all round me are thousands of people who have not a shred of household equipment left. I want to get out of this job. It doesn't make sense." In all probability the factory would not be destroyed when it came to the point. But the lack of a constructive objective in policy has lost the services of many good officers, and has brought profound disquiet to many people in this country who know even a little about present conditions in Germany.

PRESUPPOSITIONS OF A POSITIVE POLICY IN GERMANY

It is important that we should be aware that the British and American policy of rebuilding some sort of viable German economy means that, although we do not say so, we believe that given the opportunity and the assistance, the Germans can set out on another course which will lead them in the end to a place among the nations of Europe. Mr. Bevin's policy carries with it the implication that the foul doctrines of blood, soil and race can be cast out of the German mentality, that something can be learned from defeat and suffering, and a new beginning made.

The word " re-education " is a presumptuous word. It is impossible to believe that a great nation (and the Germans

are a great nation, even if they have been degraded by Nazism and broken by defeat) and a nation so self-conscious and so philosophically-minded as the German nation, should be capable of being re-educated in any real sense by their conquerors, even if the task were physically possible. Nor can they, beginning where they are now, re-educate themselves. It is actual living experience, events and happenings which in the end teach, and the only experiences now open to the German people are those which the great powers allow them.

The British Government has put most of its faith in political parties and trade unions as the means of fostering democratic action. Only a small minority of Germans, most of them men whose memories go back beyond Hitler, take an active part in politics, but among the 13,700 youth clubs in the British zone, there are many run by political parties and trade unions which will presumably feed the political parties at a later date. But when one considers the daily struggle to keep alive in Germany, the marvel is that there is as much political activity as there is, and that there is life in the political situation. For the very fact that the parties show marked differences in different parts of Germany, so that for example the Christian Democratic Union which in the west is strongly Catholic and anti-socialist, in Berlin is much nearer to the Socialists, is an indication that the Germans themselves are putting their mark on the parties and using them as instruments. There is a great deal of unnecessary misunderstanding in many places between Christians and Social Democrats. In other places there are Christian groups within the S.P.D. as for example in Hanover, where the Prime Minister is a member of such a group. Many Christians are entering politics, some for the first time, and they bring into the political scene, and to some extent into the Church, a new element in German life—an attempt to integrate Christian thinking and political action at the practical level. Bishop Dibelius in Berlin, for example, preaches sermons on this practical level, and this attracts the ordinary man who is little moved by the older forms of Lutheran pietistic preaching. The importance of this

awakening of at least some Christians to political responsibilities is even recognized by the communists who are out to catch the new Christian voter. Thus a communist poster in Düsseldorf at election time last year read :—

The Christian votes C.D.U.
The true Christian votes S.P.D.
The tolerant Christian votes F.D.P.[1]
The Christian Socialist votes Communist.

In the Russian zone the two parties allowed are the Communists and the C.D.U., the latter containing many whose views are strongly socialist. We wrote in a C.N-L. about eighteen months ago that there seemed no chance, on the basis of evidence then available, of a democratic-cum-Christian revival. This letter reached a Christian in the Russian zone who had stood successfully as a C.D.U. candidate and strongly disagreed with our view. Never were we better pleased at being contradicted by one of our readers !

THE IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

There is, therefore, some hope that through actual participation in politics, Germans are beginning to start new lines of political thinking in their country which may one day have important results.

But in a chaotic situation when all men and women are preoccupied with the problem of mere survival and despair is all too easy, education in its more specialized sense of schools and colleges takes on a new importance. Schools and colleges then become the main hope of selecting the best from the heritage of the past and passing it on to the young. For all the young, the Nazi regime made a radical breach in the continuity of the best in the European tradition. Another important function of the school in a community which has been broken up and reduced almost to chaos, is to build for children a small, disciplined and at least partially secure community within the surrounding hopelessness.

[1] Free Democratic Party.

In the British zone a creditable amount of progress has been made in getting schools and colleges open. In conditions in which there is every incentive for the young to drift into barbarism, it is an immense achievement to have got into the schools, even on a shift basis, over three million children. Most of these children are fed once a day by the education authorities, and 900,000 pairs of shoes have been sent from this country. Six million text-books have been supplied to replace books destroyed in bombing or withdrawn from use. Yet the difficulties are enormous. The average number of children to one teacher in junior and intermediate schools is seventy, and the average age of teachers is over fifty (incidentally, one wonders who in the Control Commission has time to spare on the elaborate collection and presentation of statistics, and whether this time is perhaps being taken from the real job). The position of secondary schools is far worse. With blackboard and chalk much can be done in an elementary school, but only such a famine of books as now exists in Germany can really bring home to an educator the fact that education *is* books. There is not a single history text-book in schools in the British zone. Sound teaching of history is essential but it is impossible without books, for German teachers know no other interpretation of German history than that which they were taught.

Twenty-eight training colleges are already opened in the British zone and new teachers will in due course arrive in the schools. Six universities in the British zone, at Hamburg, Kiel, Cologne, Bonn, Göttingen and Münster are now working. Universities are fuller than they were before the war, although only a few students have any hope of work at the end of their studies. The university of Berlin lies in the Russian sector. The Russians give high priority to its requirements, and it is one of the few places where fuel is sufficient and the electric light is never cut.

So far education in the British zone has been a branch of the Internal Affairs and Communications division of the Control Commission. Its British education officers, most of them drawn from secondary school teaching, are tackling

with considerable success the difficult task of inspecting schools over a wide area. Their first duty was to weed out and dismiss Nazi teachers, and this negative task has so far occupied a great deal of their time. They have also to do their best to make it physically possible for schools to go on. Here the best of them put up a stiff fight, on behalf of the teachers, with the powers in control of supplies to obtain the materials to patch roofs, mend windows, make equipment and procure books, paper and pencils. In the small amount of time left many of these education officers make a success of the most important part of their job, that of getting alongside the German teachers as fellow educators, and encouraging every hopeful growth of healthy ideas and sound educational practice.

The appointment of Mr. Robert Birley, headmaster of Charterhouse, to a new post in charge of all education in the British zone and responsible directly to the deputy Military Governor is a sign that high priority is going to be given in future to educational requirements.

A PLACE IN THE WORLD

Whatever may be done by the Germans and ourselves to foster the growth of new ideas, one thing remains entirely in the hands of the great powers. Mr. Bevin, perhaps unconsciously, talks about "the German problem"—not about "the German menace". This is the beginning of constructive thinking about Germany's place in the world. The spectacle of a nation building up for itself a neurotic and altogether false and cruel view of its place in the world, backed by crypto-scientific fantasies of racial superiority, was one which in war we could only regard with hatred and oppose with force.[1] Delivered from it, we can now recover a necessary degree of detachment and regard the emergence of Nazism and the broken people which it has left behind as a problem, a European problem. We are Europeans, and

[1] Yet even during the war such a book as *The German Mind and Outlook* (Chapman and Hall, 9s. 6d. Out of print), a collection of six lectures delivered in 1942 and 1943, and published in 1945, fastened attention on the fact that Germany was a problem as well as an enemy.

it is, therefore, our problem too: but we have just that degree of detachment from the continent which ought to help us, without patronage and condescension, to thinking less neurotically than most of Germany's neighbours about this matter. Ultimately the false view of her place in the world can only be exorcised if there is some worth-while place for this nation to fulfil. The practical difficulties are going to be very great. No nation in Europe is going to stand for the moral principle that regeneration is possible if Britain does not. The middle course between sentimentality and toughness, both equally destructive of true regeneration is by no means clear or easy. We consistently disbelieved, denied and betrayed the resistance to Hitler in Germany from 1933 on, and it is not going to be easy for us as a country to give wise support to regenerative forces and groups in Germany. Here Christians in this country as members of the Church, which is the only institution which came through the Nazi period still partially intact, have their opportunity of giving this support through the unofficial links of the Churches.

The facts set out by Mr. Victor Gollancz in his terrible book *In Darkest Germany* are substantiated by every visitor. It is wholly good for us, the British, to be told again and again what obliteration bombing followed by semi-starvation have done, and are doing to the German people, but it is extremely bad for the Germans. There have been enough visitors going round, taking photographs and saying, "How awful!" One admires the sturdy reaction of the little headmistress of the now famous Bunker school, who remarked that she had had enough of visitors, they kept the children from their work, and the toughness of a German woman who writes: "I know the utter hopelessness of our situation—after all, we are all in the same boat—but I cannot understand this self-pity, this complacent wallowing in misery. I know perfectly well that conditions are terrible beyond words and I know too that the absence of any silver lining is even more discouraging than the actual starvation and tuberculosis, but I think that this should lead to a certain dignity rather than to this wailing and abusing the

world for the wrongs done to Germany." It is right that parcels of food and clothing should be sent by us as individuals to individual Germans as tokens of friendship, but disastrous if this kind of action leads us to regard Germans and Germany primarily as objects of pity. That is an insult to those in Germany who are trying to emphasize the suffering that Germany has inflicted and lift people above self-pity.

It is essential to remember that the Germans, who produced Nazism, were not a barbaric, uncivilized people, but a nation who held education in the highest respect, and who for that very reason were far more deeply influenced by the teachings of their philosophers than any other people in Europe. Abstractions of thought were turned by them into popular *myths*, which a German dictionary defines as "symbolic ideas with lifegiving force". Karl Mannheim used constantly to point out that these myths, which never get mentioned at conference tables, are the motivating force in the life of a nation. The Nazis knew how to manipulate and use them. They are being created now in Germany by events, and one which is growing in power is the conception of the *Abendland*, in which the German sees himself, as so many did who died on the Russian front, as the defender of the West.

It is no use trying to destroy this myth, but it can be used. We very greatly hope that when Mr. Bevin returns from Moscow he will not exclusively emphasize the fact that a reintegrated economy in Germany will save the British taxpayer 80 or 100 million pounds. We hope he will say that he believes such a policy to be right and just and, in a gloomy world, a little hopeful.

Kathleen Bliss

EASTER

In this time of tension between Russia and the West it should never be forgotten that some of the greatest Christian thinkers in the nineteenth century (as in the twentieth) were Russians.

No figure in the conflict between the Christian and the secular views of life is more significant than that of Dostoievsky. No one penetrated further than he did into the unsuspected depths of the human problem, reflected in the experience of the common man, of the unhappy and the depraved, nor saw more clearly the inescapable choice between demonic possession, ending in the destruction of all values, and the reconciliation of man with God through faith in Christ and the creation of a new man.

A no less notable figure was his young friend and disciple, Vladimir Soloviev (1853–1900), the greatest of Russian philosophers, who died prematurely at the early age of forty-seven. Like his teacher Dostoievsky, he had a strong belief in Russia's spiritual mission, and he wrestled throughout his life with the problem of the relations of Russia with the West. Steeped in the Russia tradition and master of the wide range of western culture, he was in an unequalled degree a good Russian and a good European, and his most recent biographer, a learned Jesuit Father,[1] believes that the two streams of tradition and culture were in him blended into so rich and impressive a unity that he may yet prove to be the greatest of all mediating influences.

We are not concerned in this Supplement, however, with Soloviev's life and thought in general, but with what he has to say to us about death and resurrection in the last and most impressive of his writings published shortly before his death. In

[1] Friedrich Muckermann, S. J., *Solowiew: Zur Begegnung zwischen Russland und dem Abendland.* Verlag Otto Walter, Olten.

this book, *Three Discussions*,[1] he presents to a wide public in an exceptionally vivid and forcible way, his ultimate convictions about the meaning of human life and destiny.

THE POWER OF EVIL

Two years before he wrote the volume, as he tells us in the preface, he had passed through a spiritual crisis. The question presented itself to him acutely whether evil is merely a natural defect, an imperfection that will disappear of itself with the growth of good, or whether it is a real *power*, exercising dominion over our world, so that it can be successfully overcome only through aid from another sphere of being. He thought at first of a philosophical treatment of this vital question, but he realized how important the problem of evil is for everybody. He found in himself a strong and firm desire " to illuminate in some clear and easy way the main aspects of the problem of evil which concerns everyone ".

He was puzzled for a long time by the question of the most suitable medium for realizing his purpose. He unexpectedly found himself, however, during a stay abroad, spontaneously composing and writing in a few days a drawing-room discussion in which several different characters take part. On his return to Russia he carried on the theme in two further discussions. The participants are a Politician, who is the exponent of the rationalist belief in progress ; a General, who is a stout defender of the relative moral values found in war, when the higher values have to be protected by the sword ; a Prince, who under the thinnest of disguises is Count Leo Tolstoy ; a Mr. Z, through whom Soloviev expresses his own ideas ; and their hostess, who enlivens the conversations by fervent and generally rather fatuous interjections.

The climax of the argument is reached in the third discussion, in which Soloviev expresses the innermost core of his own

[1] Two translations have appeared in English, one under the title *War, Progress and the End of History* with a preface by Dr. Hagberg Wright, and the other entitled *War and Christianity from the Russian Point of View* with an introduction by Stephen Graham. Both unfortunately are out of print and practically unobtainable.

ultimate beliefs in an all-out attack on the teaching of Tolstoy. Whether he is in all respects fair to Tolstoy need not concern us here. What claims our attention is the positive faith to which Soloviev gives passionate expression.

PROGRESS AND DEATH

The attack is opened, in the temporary absence of the Prince from the drawing-room, by a critical examination of the Politician's belief in evolutionary progress, i.e. the optimistic view that mankind has advanced from a state of savagery to the high civilization of Europe, and that this will gradually expand to embrace the rest of the world and blend all peoples into a peaceful and harmonious international whole. Evil will die an inevitable death, and the amount of good will steadily increase through the very nature of things.

Mr. Z. asks whether the coming achievements of culture will include the total extinction of disease and death. The Politician is inclined to be optimistic about the conquest of disease. Mr. Z. presses the point that the undeniable successes on the positive side are almost equally certain to be balanced by neuropathic and psychopathic disorders characteristic of an advanced culture ; that while the *plus* increases the *minus* grows at the same time. And in regard to death it seems that nothing but *nil* has ever been obtained in the progress of culture.

The Politician admits that progress has never set before itself as an objective the extinction of death. Mr. Z. replies that for this reason it cannot be rated very high. If I know that I myself and all that is dear to me are to disappear for ever, is it not quite immaterial to me what happens in the rest of the world ? " If the final result of your progress and culture is but the death of one and all, it is then clear that every kind of activity for the cause of progress and civilization is for no purpose and has no sense."

Not every one will agree with Soloviev's categorical assertion that, if death ends all, life does not make sense. Even if death is the last word, life would still, many feel, be worth living. Our purpose here is not to argue the question, but merely to take note that this is the point to which his wide-ranging experience

had brought Soloviev. We are reminded of the well-known passage in Arthur James Balfour's *Foundations of Belief*:

> Man will go down into the pit, and all his thoughts will perish. The uneasy consciousness, which in this obscure corner has for a brief space broken the contented silence of the universe, will be at rest. Imperishable monuments and immortal deeds, death itself and love stronger than death, will be as though they had never been. Nor will anything that *is* be better, or be worse, for all that the labour, genius, devotion and suffering of man have striven through countless generations to effect.

To Lord Balfour, as to Soloviev, the question seemed inescapable whether so transitory and unimportant an accident in the general scheme of things as the fortunes of the human race can continue to satisfy aspirations and emotions nourished upon belief in the Everlasting and the Divine.

Soloviev proceeds to develop his thesis. At the point we have reached the Prince rejoins the discussion and proceeds to expound his doctrine that men have only to carry out the teaching of Christ and the Kingdom of God will be established on earth.

Soloviev fastens on this position and step by step drives the argument home. The Prince's contention is that, if we refuse to resist evil by force, evil will immediately disappear. It follows that evil exists only through our resistance to it or through the way in which we attempt to deal with it and has no real power of its own. If evil has no existence in reality, how are we to explain the startling failure of Christ's cause in history? Christ (according to Tolstoy) preached the true good in a clearer, more powerful and more consistent way than anyone else in history. He carried out to the end the demands of the good by suffering without resistance the torments of the crucifixion. He died and did not rise again. Thousands of his followers have suffered the same fate. Nothing has come of it all. The blood of the martyrs has, indeed, been the seed of the Church, but for Tolstoy the Church is nothing but the distortion and ruin of true Christianity, and the whole process has to be started again nearly two thousand years later with no greater guarantee of success. "There is only one indubitable and permanent end to all such

practice of good, for those who initiated it, for those who distorted and ruined it and for those who have been restoring it. They all, according to you, died in the past, die in the present, will die in the future. And from the practice of good, the preaching of truth nothing but death ever came, comes or promises to come." Evil is obviously more powerful than good. If we have to recognize the extreme physical evil of death as final and absolute, then no imaginary victories of good in the individual or in the social sphere can be regarded as real successes. What would be the good of ephemeral and superficial victories over evil, if it is allowed to triumph in the deepest strata of Being over the very foundations of life ?

RESURRECTION

What then, the Politician asks, is your remedy against despair ? " The remedy is," the answer comes, " one actual resurrection." The struggle between good and evil is not confined to soul or society but is carried on at deeper levels of existence. We have in the past a victory of the good power of life, which is the guarantee of future resurrection. The Kingdom of God is the kingdom of life triumphing through resurrection—in which *life* lies the real, actual and final good. Without faith in the accomplished resurrection of the One and in the future resurrection of all men, all talk about the Kingdom of God is nothing but words, since in reality one finds nothing but the Kingdom of death.

Tolstoy was quite entitled, like everyone else, Soloviev maintains, to hold the views which he did. What was preposterous was that he should call them Christian. Authentic Christianity was something totally different. It was not concerned with the practice of our ideals in the teeth of forces of the universe indifferent or hostile to them, but with the *inspiration* of the good, or the direct and positive action of the good power itself on us and within us. Morality has to be transformed into a real life in the good. The real victory over evil is the real resurrection. This, and this alone, opens the real Kingdom of God. Without it you have only the Kingdom of sin and death. If we really believe in the good and in its power, we are bound to recognize that power as unlimited and to believe in the truth of resurrection.

THE COSMIC MEANING OF CHRISTIANITY

In Soloviev's view the concern of Christianity is not simply the saving of individual souls. His thought takes a wider sweep, and he sees Christianity as the unveiling of the meaning of the whole cosmic process. The clue to history is the growth of divine-humanity, having its source and origin in the historical manifestation of God in Christ. He is one with St. Paul in the hope that creation itself will be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.

It is not from an age of faith that Soloviev's message comes to us. The generation to which he proclaimed it had become almost completely secularized and sceptical. The Christianity in which he saw the one hope for the world had become in their eyes entirely discredited. He saw without illusion the direction in which things were moving. With an amazing and untiring energy he set himself to reverse the prevailing tendencies of the time, inspired by his invincible faith that, real and terrible as is the power of evil, the good had triumphed over it in historical fact.

It is a question, however, whether the *Three Discussions*, written shortly before his death, does not mark a significant change in his own outlook; whether the polemic directed against Tolstoy is not aimed also in part, consciously or unconsciously, against his own past. To what extent he himself regarded it as such we do not know; it is a secret which he carried with him to his grave.

There is no doubt that his earlier writings were characterized by a certain optimism. He saw in the history of religion the progressive revelation of God culminating in Christianity; and in the gradual realization of divine-humanity the fulfilment of the purpose of God. This hope inspired his belief in Russia's mission and his unremitting efforts to bring about the reunion of the Churches, and in particular of Orthodoxy and Rome, as a means to the spiritual unification of mankind.

But his awakening to the radical nature of evil and the power of its dominion raised in his mind the doubt whether his hopes of the progressive permeation of an advancing culture by the

spirit of Christianity might not be mistaken, and whether the appearance and reign of Anti-Christ may not be the closing scene of the tragedy of history. The discussions are brought to a close by the reading of a manuscript entitled " A Short Story of the Anti-Christ ", in which the course of events leading up to the end of the world is depicted. This coming anti-Christianity will not be, Soloviev insists, an open denial of Christianity nor any crude form of materialism, but a great religious usurpation and imposture, in which the name of Christ is claimed by forces that are in practice and in their very essence alien and inimical to Christ and to his Spirit. It will proclaim spiritual ideals and offer the blessings of universal peace. In the legend the great majority of Christians of all confessions are led away by the attractiveness and power of Anti-Christ and give him their allegiance. Only a small remnant of the faithful see through the imposture. Their leaders of the different confessions assemble in Jerusalem, a small and hunted company, and in the midst of a dark night, on a high and deserted spot, the unification of the Churches takes place. Christ returns in triumph to earth, history reaches its end, and our temporal existence, which is subject to corruption and death, is swallowed up in a final victory of life.

The question which Soloviev saw to be crucial is with us to-day. It is more and more impossible to shut our eyes to the reality, range and demonic power of evil. The question becomes more insistent whether to a pervasive evil which threatens to overwhelm our world it is enough to oppose the practice of our ideals, or whether we must not face in all its implications the tremendous assertion of Christianity that evil has been defeated and the Good has triumphed in the sphere of what *is*.

J. H. O.

Subscriptions—12s. 6d. ($3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada) for one year. 6s. 6d. for six months (Great Britain and Ireland only). Single copies 6d.; reduction for quantities.

Bound Volumes—Vols. II—X (May 1940—Dec. 1945) 8s. 6d. each post free, or 7s. 6d. each in sets of four or more consecutive volumes.

Indices—Vols I—XI (Oct. 1939—Dec. 1946), 1s. each post free.

Folders—To hold six months' supply, 3s. each post free.

Groups—Special rates for group subscriptions may be had on application.

All communications and subscriptions should be sent to—
THE CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, 20 BALCOMBE STREET, DORSET SQUARE, LONDON, N.W. 1.

Published by Dr. J. H. Oldham for the Christian Frontier Council, and printed in Great Britain by the Church Army Press, Cowley, Oxford.